

IN THE

Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE

Fifth Appellate District

F056935 People v. Navarro

The judgment is affirmed with modifications. Dawson, J.

I concur: Poochigian, J.; Dissenting opinion by Cornell, J.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

F059786 People v. The Superior Court of Fresno Co.; Markus

Let a writ of mandate issue directing the respondent court to vacate its orders filed on or about February 10, 2010, in Fresno County Superior Court action no. F09906626, denying petitioner's motion for conditional examinations and to enter appropriate orders granting said motion.

This court notes petitioner stated at the hearing that defendant "would need counsel appointed to her in absentia." Petitioner's declaration contains evidence that defendant was indigent.

By the Court.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

F059241 People v. Jenkins

The above-entitled case is submitted for decision.

F059241 People v. Jenkins

The judgment is affirmed.

By the Court.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

F060450 In re L.S., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law

The above-entitled case is submitted for decision.

IN THE
Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE
Fifth Appellate District

F060450 **In re L.S., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law**
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal in the above-entitled
action is dismissed.

By the Court.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

F059373 **People v. Brown**
Oral argument having been waived in the above-entitled case in
accordance with the provisions of a notice mailed to counsel, the case
is submitted for decision.

F059373 **People v. Brown**
The judgment is affirmed.

By the Court.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

F059459 **People v. Sanchez**
The above-entitled case is submitted for decision.

F059459 **People v. Sanchez**
The judgment is affirmed.

By the Court.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

IN THE
Court of Appeal of the State of California

IN AND FOR THE
Fifth Appellate District

F060390 Dominguez v. The Superior Court Of Tulare County; The People et al.

This court concludes that the trial court abused its discretion in refusing to order disclosure of the complaint.

Nothing in this opinion prevents the trial court from fashioning a protective order as requested by RPI.

The petition expressly prays for a “peremptory writ.” RPI filed opposition on the merits of the petition. A peremptory writ of mandate is proper and should issue. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1088; *Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc.* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 171, 180.)

Petitioner is entitled to appropriate relief. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1085; see *Whitney’s at the Beach v Superior Court* (1970) 3 Cal.App.3d 258, 266.)

Let a peremptory writ of mandate issue directing respondent court to vacate its order filed on or about May 26, 2010, in Tulare County Superior Court action no. VCF231205 denying petitioner’s motion for disclosure of the complaint and to enter an order granting said motion.

Trial in Tulare County Superior Court action No. VCF231205 is stayed only until this opinion is final in all courts of this state, the California Supreme Court grants review in this proceeding, or the superior court complies with the directions stated above, whichever shall first occur; thereafter said stay is vacated and dissolved.

By the Court.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]

F057877 People v. Lara

Oral argument having been waived in the above-entitled case in accordance with the provisions of a notice mailed to counsel, the case is submitted for decision.

F057877 People v. Lara

The judgment is affirmed.

By the Court.

[NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS]